

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant's attorney wishes to thank Examiner Rahman for the courtesies extended during the telephone conference of June 13, 2006.

Claims 8, 9, 17, 22, and 24 stand objected to for a variety of informalities. By amendment to these claims, Applicant has corrected errors identified by the Examiner.

Claims 9 and 24 stand withdrawn because the Examiner provided a prior art reference that allegedly taught the "wake-up command" limitation as featured in claims 8 and 21. Thus, according to the Action, examination on the merits for claims 9 and 24 was not necessary. Applicant amended claim 9 such that it now depends upon claim 7 and such that the wireless command includes at least one of media display command. Similarly, Applicants amended claim 24 to state that "when the wireless command includes a media display command, the media display command is at least one of" As amended, the Office may no longer rely on a prior art reference that allegedly teaches the "wake-up command" limitation to avoid examination on the merits. Claims 9 and 24 are presented for examination on the merits.

Claims 16–20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.K. Patent Application Publication No. 0117150.3 to Wang et al. ("Wang"). With respect to claim 16, Applicant respectfully notes the Wang fails to teach each and every claim limitation and thus does not anticipate Applicant's claimed subject matter.

Claim 16 has been amended to correct a typographical error and to maintain antecedent basis for the term "wake-up command." Claim 16 has also been amended to clarify claim language directed at: (1) providing at least one input port capable of receiving a peripheral device; and (2) transmitting, by the remote connector, the wake-up command to a processing system operably coupleable to the remote connector across an output bus.

Wang is allegedly directed to a system and “method of remotely starting a wireless USB peripheral device in a computer system.” However, Applicant respectfully notes that the Wang reference does not appear to be an enabling disclosure as required by 35 U.S.C. § 102 and MPEP §2121.01 for at least the reason that the only portion of the reference written in proper English and capable of being understood by Applicant is the amended claims filed after the original filing date of the reference with the UK Patent Office. The remainder of the reference appears to be apparently translated from a foreign language and does not appear to include an enabling disclosure. For example, the Office Action cites lines 4-6 of page 2 as allegedly teaching a method for remote connecting. Lines 4-6 of page 2 and lines 7-9 are reprinted below.

The object of the present invention aims is to provide a method of remote start of wireless transmission USB by means of establishing a sensor between the USB wireless perimeter and the computer host, so that the sensor could regularly supply power to the remote start for the detection of signals in the receiver and determine whether to carry out the wake-up function, as a way to converse power consumption with the USB suspend.

Applicant is unable to decipher the meaning of the terms “wireless transmission USB” and “USB wireless perimeter” and is further unable to decipher how one would “regularly supply power to the remote start” or “converse power consumption with the USB suspend.” Accordingly, Applicant is unable to give meaning to the paragraph as a whole.

The Office Action also cites lines 14-18 of page 1 and lines 1-3 of page 2 as allegedly teaching that the “remote control of wireless perimeter’s wakeup of can take significant time and energy if not done properly.” The Office Action appears to use this to provide motivation to combine teachings of Wang with Applicant’s admitted prior art. Lines 14-18 of page 1 and lines 1-3 of page 2 are reprinted below.

For the wireless perimeter, the computer USB signal emitter module and signal receiver module, when the system remains suspend, the USB keeps on consuming power as a waste. Besides,

as the perimeter of the wake-up function of wireless perimeter remote control takes a fixed period of time to repeatedly send out identification codes, it could make the emitter module work repeatedly as a waste of energy. When the system remains suspend, this phenomenon could jeopardize the normal function of the remote wake-up.

Among other things, Applicant is unable to identify or give meaning to the term “wireless perimeter” or the term “perimeter of the wake-up function of wireless perimeter remote control.” For at least this reason, this paragraph is ambiguous and does not appear to support that for which it is cited in the present Office Action.

Based on this confusing passages and irregular use of language, Applicant is unable to properly appreciate the scope of the Wang reference and therefore questions whether one having ordinary skill would, based on the document alone, be able to make and use the subject matter presented in Wang without undue experimentation.

Applicant respectfully reminds the Office that the “disclosure in an assertedly anticipating reference must provide an enabling disclosure of the desired subject matter; mere naming or description of the subject matter is insufficient if it cannot be produced without undue experimentation.” MPEP § 2121.01. Because the claims merely name or describe the subject matter allegedly described in the poor translation of the Wang written description, Applicant respectfully expresses doubt that one having ordinary skill in the art would be able to make and use the claimed subject matter without undue experimentation. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Wang may not be used as an anticipatory reference. At best, Wang may only be used in an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and even then, it does not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter as noted below. Accordingly, claims 16-20 are believed to be in proper condition for allowance.

In any event, as best understood, Wang appears to be directed toward a computer system comprising a computer host and a wireless USB peripheral device that has no additional input port that receives a peripheral connector. As stated in Wang, “the wireless USB peripheral device [is] arranged to wirelessly receive signals from the computer host.” (P. 6, ll. 1–7; Emphasis added). Wang further discloses that the wireless USB peripheral device includes a microprocessor and a sensor where the microprocessor is arranged to wake up the sensor. The sensor, upon waking up, “checks whether the receiver has received any signals ... and if the sensor detects a signal, the computer system proceeds with a REMOTE WAKE UP to wake up the wireless USB peripheral device.” (P. 6, ll. 7–20). As noted by the Office on page 8 of the present Office Action, Wang’s written description appears to indicate that the sensor 11, controlled by microprocessor 12, “carries out REMOTE WAKEUP.” (*See* Wang, p. 3, ll. 1–6, p. 6, ll. 18–20). In other words, REMOTE WAKE UP appears to be a procedure or process generated and used within the wireless USB device and not a wake-up command transmitted across an output bus or through an input/output interface to a processing system operably coupleable to the remote connector.

With respect to claim 16, Wang fails to teach, among other things, “providing at least one input port capable of receiving a peripheral connector.” However, it appears that claim language has been overlooked. The claimed “input port” is of a type that can receive a “peripheral connector.” For example, the input port may allow the insertion of peripheral connectors. (*See e.g.*, specification ¶ 0035 and elsewhere). Applicant respectfully submit that the Wang device does not have such a physical port. If the rejection is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests a showing within Wang where this limitation is disclosed.

Claim 16 further requires “generating a wake-up command in response to the wireless command; and transmitting, by the remote connector, the wake-up command to a processing system operably coupleable to the remote connector across an output bus.” The Office Action states that these limitations are disclosed by lines 16-18 and lines 1-2 of page 6, respectively. According to the Office Action, “the wake-up of USB peripheral must be conducted to both of the host computer’s and the USB peripheral’s processing unit so that the USB peripheral can be started from suspended state” and that “the wireless USB peripheral is connected to the host computer through USB bus.” As best understood by Applicant, the Office Action is equating the detected signals in the Wang receiver (a component of the wireless USB peripheral device) with the claimed wireless command and the REMOTE WAKE UP of Wang with Applicant’s claimed wake-up command. To the extent the detected signals and REMOTE WAKE UP are comparable to the claimed subject matter, Wang appears to teach detecting the signals and subsequently proceeding with REMOTE WAKE UP. However, unlike the claimed wake-up command, the REMOTE WAKE UP of Wang appears to be a procedure or process generated by and used within the wireless USB peripheral device and does not appear to be a wake-up command transmitted across an output bus to a processing system operably coupleable to the remote connector, as claimed. For at least this reason, claim 16 is further in condition for allowance.

Because Wang fails to teach each and every limitation presented in claim 16, Applicant respectfully presents claim 16 for allowance over the cited prior art.

Claims 17–20 depend upon allowable claim 16 and further contains additional novel and nonobvious subject matter. For at least these reasons, claims 17–20 are further believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1–3 and 5–15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant’s admission of prior art and further in view of Wang. Applicants, however, note that claim 9 was withdrawn from consideration and was not substantively rejected in the body of the Action. Accordingly, only claims 1–3, 5–8, and 10–15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant’s admission of prior art and further in view of Wang.

Claim 1 has been amended to reflect that the remote connector comprises “a transmitter capable of generating a wake-up command in response to the wireless command and capable of providing the wake-up command through an input/output interface to a processing unit operably coupleable to the remote connector.” Applicant notes that no new matter has been introduced in the aforementioned amendment as support may be found in Applicant’s written description at least in ¶ 0024.

As to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action fails to identify prior art that teaches or suggests a “transmitter capable of generating a wake-up command in response to the wireless command and providing the wake-up command through an input/output interface to a processing unit operably coupleable to the remote connector.” (Emphasis added). The Office Action states that the REMOTE WAKEUP is carried out by [the] sensor and microprocessor [and] the computer system is to wake up the USB peripheral. Therefore, the remote connector comprises a transmitter to send the necessary wake up signals to perform REMOTE WAKE UP of USB peripheral by the system.” (Page 8). As best understood by Applicant, the Office Action appears to equate the sensor and microprocessor of the USB peripheral device (*See* Wang, p. 6, ll. 7–11) to Applicant’s claimed processing unit. At the same time, however, the Office Action appears to equate Wang’s USB peripheral device to Applicant’s claimed remote connector (Office Action, p. 7). This is improper. Because the claim requires the processing unit to be

operably coupleable to the remote connector, the USB peripheral device cannot be equated to both claim elements.

In any event, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above with respect to claim 16. That is, Wang appears to teach detecting signals in the receiver of the wireless USB peripheral device and subsequently proceeding with REMOTE WAKE UP. However, unlike the claimed wake-up command, the REMOTE WAKE UP of Wang appears to be a procedure or process generated by and used within the wireless USB peripheral device and does not appear to be a wake-up command that is provided through an input/output interface to a processing unit operably coupleable to the remote connector, as claimed. For this reason, claim 1 is also properly allowable over the cited prior art.

Accordingly, claim 1 appears to be in proper condition for allowance.

Claims 2–3 and 5–9 depend upon allowable claim 1 and further contain additional novel and nonobvious subject matter. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits claims 2–9 for immediate allowance.

Claim 10 has been amended to include limitations of claim 11. Claim 11 is cancelled without prejudice. As to newly amended claim 10, Applicant respectfully notes that the Action fails to identify prior art that teaches or suggests “an input/output port capable of operably coupling the remote connector to a processing unit, such that the wake-up command may be provided to the processing unit,” as claimed. Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above with respect to claim 1 where Applicant submitted that Wang fails to teach or suggest “a transmitter ... capable of providing the wake-up command through an input/output interface to a processing unit operably coupleable to the remote connector.” For the same or

similar reasons, claim 1 is allowable over the cited prior art, Applicant respectfully submits that newly amended claim 10 also appears to be in proper condition for allowance.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action appears to contradict itself in its rejection of claim 11 where it appears to equate an alleged processing unit of the host computer with the claimed processing unit. However, as explained above with respect to claim 1, the Office Action previously equated the sensor and microprocessor of the wireless USB peripheral device with the claimed processing unit. Because the Office Action did not appear to proffer these assertions in the alternative, the contradiction is in error.

For at least these reasons, claim 10 appears to be in proper condition for this reason alone.

Claims 12–15 depend upon allowable claim 10 and further contains additional novel and nonobvious subject matter. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully believes claims 12–15 to also be in condition for allowance over Applicant’s admitted prior art and Wang.

Claims 21–23 were rejected using Applicant’s admission of prior art and Wang. However, the Action fails to specifically articulate which section of the Patent Act is the basis for the rejections. For purposes of this response, however, Applicant assumes that the Office is using 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as the basis for these rejections. If the Office is of a different opinion, Applicant respectfully requests a nonfinal action clarifying this issue.

Claim 21 has been amended to indicate that “an output bus [is] capable of operably coupling the remote connector to a processing unit. As to newly amended claim 21, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks above with respect to claims 1 and 10 and therefore submits that the Action fails to identify prior art that teaches or suggest the aforementioned

limitation. For at least the reasons articulated above, claim 21 appears to be in proper condition for allowance.

Additionally, Applicant notes that no combination of cited art teaches or describes the claimed “suspend mode detector capable of receiving a suspend mode indicator from the processing unit such that the transmitter can determine if the wake-up command needs to be generated.” The Office asserts that “there must be a suspend mode detector in the USB peripheral capable of receiving a suspend mode indicator from the processing unit” because “the USB peripheral device of Wang et al is suspended when operation is not required.” This assertion is improper for at least the reason that Wang does not utilize a suspend mode indicator. Applicant respectfully notes that when operation is not required, the USB peripheral device of Wang is suspended when the sensor detects no signal. Conversely, when a signal is received, REMOTE WAKE UP is used to wake up the wireless USB peripheral device. (*See* Wang, p. 6, ll. 13–18). If the Examiner maintains this rejection, Applicant respectfully requests a showing by page and line number where Wang teaches each element of “a suspend mode detector capable of receiving a suspend mode indicator from the processing unit [distinct from the remote connector] such that the transmitter can determine if the wake-up command needs to be generated.”

Accordingly, Applicant earnestly requests that the rejection with respect to claim 21 be withdrawn.

Claims 22–24 depend upon allowable claim 21 and further contain additional novel and nonobvious subject matter. For at least these reasons, claims 22–24 are also believed to be allowable over Applicant’s admitted prior art and Wang.


Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant’s admission of prior art in view of Wang and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No.

2004/0198233 to Pratt et al. (“Pratt”). Claim 4 depends upon allowable claim 1 and further contain additional novel and nonobvious subject matter.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits claim 4 for immediate allowance. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/13/06

By: 
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60601
phone: (312) 609-7599
fax: (312) 609-5005